EPSON Research and Development, Inc.
A Seiko Epson Subsidiary

FAX TRANSMITTAL

ATTN: Examiner Thu Ha   FROM: Rosalio Haro
(ART Unit 2155)   Nguyen   Tel. No.: (408) 952- 6131

DATE: 5/13/04   PAGE(S)
                               (Incl. cover sheet) 3

Re: Application N: 09/329/182

Requested Agenda for telephone interview
scheduled for Monday 17, 2004
at 2:00pm E.S.T.

Fax No. (703) 872-9306

Sender's Initials:_____

_____ Original will follow by: _____ Original will NOT follow.
      _____ US Mail
      _____ FEDEX

150 River Oaks Parkway, Suite 225, San Jose, CA 95134
Telephone (408) 952-6000   Facsimile (408) 954-9058

ESP012.I
Application No.: 09/329,182

Agenda of desired discussion topics.

Each item's identifying number corresponds to an enumerated item in the outstanding
Office Action.

Item 3:

The Office Action requests support for the cited limitation. Would the following excerpts
provide sufficient support to the Examiner's satisfaction?

page 3, line 23 to page 4, line 1,
"The input device receives a request from the destination device and transmits the input
data to a location based on the request."

page 4, line 15 to 21.
"The apparatus initiates transmission of the input data by notifying the destination device
that data is ready for transmission, receives a request from the destination device, and
transmits the input data to a location based on the request from the destination device"

Item 6:

Generally, much of the cited reasons for rejection are similar to those previously
submitted, and there is no mention of why our previous arguments were not persuasive.
Rather than repeating the same arguments for the same cited references, we would like to
better understand your interpretation of the cited prior art so that we may address your
concerns directly.

For example, it was previously noted that the cited references refer to internal file
transfers, not to communication with a "remote storage device". Please explain how the
internal architecture and internal file management of a copier is related art to the file
transfer sequence among multiple computers on a network.

Generally, I would like to better understand how the prior art to Uno is being interpreted
broadly enough to encompass the claimed invention. The cited excerpts do not appear to
describe what the Office Action asserts is being taught by them.

The Office action also appears to equate the submitting of an email address to the
identifying of a destination device. Applicants previously submitted arguments
distinguishing the two. What about our previous arguments was not persuasive?
Basically, one difference is that an email address identifies a personal ID and can be
stored in any of many email servers. To retrieve an email file, a person logs onto an
email distributing service, identifies oneself, and requests that the email files (wherever
they may be) be found and transmitted to once current location.
    By contrast, by identifying a destination device, one can know exactly in what
machine, i.e. destination device, the a target file is located and retrieve the file directly.

One does not rely on an intermediate machine, i.e. the email server, to locate and serve the file to oneself.

Also in regards to Uno, the Office Action states that receiving and retrieving are the same thing. In data communications, receiving means that data is "pushed" to ones' machine (i.e. the receiving machine may, or may not, know what is being received), while retrieving means pulling requested data. Also, Uno describes sending files by email. As explained in the previous paragraph, we are not clear on how receiving email from an anonymous location (i.e. as determined by the email server) is the same as retrieving data from a known location.

In regards to Manglapus, he teaches that after a print job is submitted, the sender is notified of which one of multiple printers was assigned the task of printing the print job. We are unclear as to how this sequence is related to the present invention.

Item 7:
This rejection appears to be based on the equating of network communication protocols with data file formats. Is this correct?

Item 8:
We are at a loss to determine where the cited reference (Fig. 12, col. 10 lines 40-64) suggests that a destination device retrieves image data if and only if it determines that its physical parameters are capable of manipulating the image data.